

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2007

- 10 -

Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on March 06, 2007. Claims 1-38 are standing for examination. The Examiner rejects claims 16-19, 22, 25, 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No 5,868,400 Carter III, hereinafter Carter. Claims 7, 9, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter. Claims 1-15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26 and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter.

In response to the rejections and comments provided by the Examiner, applicant herein amends the claims to particularly point out the subject matter considered patentable over the art by applicant. Applicant provides arguments pointing out the subject matter in the claims, as amended, deemed patentable by applicant over the art of Carter provided by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 16, 25 and 32 are herein amended to positively recite that a plurality of object-oriented data pricing models are generated and made part of the database wherein a price requesting client is identified and one of the data models associated with the client is selected by the system to fulfill the pricing request, the model completely defining the client, a channel, and a product category, to generate the requested pricing results.

Applicant argues that the pricing system of Carter fails to teach object-oriented pricing models completely defining the client, a channel, and a product category, to generate the requested pricing results, as claimed. One with skill in the art of object-oriented presentation will appreciate that the system of the present invention not only decreases the need for storing tuples in numerous repetitive data tables, but reduces computation required of prior-art systems in drilling down to specific client and products ordered by considering everything in the trees above the position of the client and product in the tree.

- 11 -

Applicant points out that Carter clearly teaches organizing various pricing tables and price adjustment tables for various products and purchasing entities based on which purchasing entity is purchasing which specific product. The invention utilizes de-normalized numbers in tables to relate the requesting purchaser to the product desired. The different types of purchasers and the various types of products offered are organized into hierarchical groups represented by data tables. Working by individual hierarchical levels, of which there may be many, specific price adjustments can be specified for each created level of the organizational groups and for each created level of the product groups.

Column 19 of Carter shows a method including step 1512 which performs a database query for retrieving all product records related to user specified products. The database query is directed to user specified products, the user specified purchasing organization, the identified organizational groups, and the effective dates specified by the user. In step 1514 the invention identifies all product groups that are higher than user specified products in the product group hierarchy. In step 1516 the invention performs a database query for retrieving all pricing adjustments applicable to user specified products and the user specified organization. The query is also directed to retrieving all pricing adjustments applicable to identified products and organizational groups, and to the user specified effective dates. Each pricing adjustment consists of the application of those Pricing Types that apply to user specified products (and in the user specified pricing sequence). There are further steps included for sorting the retrieved data according to numerous hierarchies. In applicant's invention using the models, as claimed these laborious steps are not necessary allowing for truly automated streamlined pricing.

At least one advantage the present invention has over prior-art systems such as the system of Carter is that when calculating pricing, only the rules for the specific factors in a sequence are navigated to determine specificity in pricing rather than the adjustments

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2007

- 12 -

for all of the entire product and sales hierarchies above the specified product and customer indicated in an order for pricing. Only the rules specific to pricing request attributes are applied in calculation. Applicant accomplishes this by storing pricing models containing associated rules for the models in the database for retrieval in response to a pricing request.

Applicant therefore believes that the independent claims, 1, 16, 25 and 32, as amended, clearly and unarguably distinguish over the invention of Carter as argued above by applicant. Depending claims 2-15, 17-24, 26-31 and 33-38, are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination are now patentable as amended and argued by applicant over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Yan Feng et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755